CHECKLIST ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Project Name:

Trenton Streeter Well and Stock Water Tank

Proposed

Implementation Date: September 2020
Proponent: Trenton Streeter
Location: 6N 20E 36 SW4

County: Trust:

Golden Valley Common Schools

I. TYPE AND PURPOSE OF ACTION

Trenton Streeter has proposed to install water well and stock water tank. The well would be run by either a solar pump or a self-starting generator and would only be used in the event the adjacent Big Coulee creek was not running. The stock tank would be immediately adjacent to the well with no pipeline.

II. PROJECT DEVELOPMENT

1. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT, AGENCIES, GROUPS OR INDIVIDUALS CONTACTED:

Provide a brief chronology of the scoping and ongoing involvement for this project.

The Department of Natural Resources and Conservation (DNRC) Northeastern Land Office (NELO) & Lewistown Unit Office

Proponent: Trenton Streeter Surface Lessees: Trenton Streeter

Other:

2. OTHER GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES WITH JURISDICTION, LIST OF PERMITS NEEDED:

The DNRC, and NELO have jurisdiction over this proposed project.

The proponent is responsible for acquiring all necessary permits for the proposed project and settling all surface damages with the surface lessees.

3. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED:

Alternative A (No Action) – Under this alternative, the Department does not grant permission to install a well and stock water tank.

Alternative B (the Proposed Action) – Under this alternative, the Department does grant to install a well and stock water tank.

III. IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

- RESOURCES potentially impacted are listed on the form, followed by common issues that would be considered.
- Explain POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATIONS following each resource heading.
- Enter "NONE" If no impacts are identified or the resource is not present.

4. GEOLOGY AND SOIL QUALITY, STABILITY AND MOISTURE:

Consider the presence of fragile, compactable or unstable soils. Identify unusual geologic features. Specify any special reclamation considerations. Identify any cumulative impacts to soils.

Table — Soil Rutting Hazard — Summary by Rating Value			0
	Summary by Rating Value		a
Summary by Rating Value			Percent of AOI
Rating	Acr	es In AOI	
Severe		21.6	55.8%
Moderate		17.3	44.2%
Totals for Area of Interest		39.0	100.0%
Table — Erosion Hazard (Off-Road, Off-Trail) — Summary by Rating Value			6
Table — Erosion Hazard (Off-Road, Off-Trail) — Summary by Rating Value	Summary by Rating Value		6
			e
Table – Erosion Hazard (Olf-Road, Olf-Trail) – Summary by Rating Value Summary by Rating Value Rating		es in AOI	Percent of AOI
Summary by Rating Value		es in AOI 34.4	Percent of AOI 88.2%
			Percent of AOI

The soils in the affected area are rated as slight for off road erosion. Drilling will be done by a small drill rig on a truck which will cause minimal disturbance. Since no large areas of vegetation will be disturbed there will be little cause for increased erosion.

Though the soils are rated as severe for rutting hazard the work will only be done in dry or frozen conditions so there should be no major risk.

No significant cumulative impacts to geology or soil quality, stability, and moisture are anticipated.

5. WATER QUALITY, QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION:

Identify important surface or groundwater resources. Consider the potential for violation of ambient water quality standards, drinking water maximum contaminant levels, or degradation of water quality. Identify cumulative effects to water resources.

This project would increase the local availability of water for livestock. There will be a very localized cone of depression when the well is in use which will be infrequent. Because the well will be so shallow and infrequently used there is not likely to be groundwater effects to the surrounding area. Also since the well will only be used when the stream is already too low to use there should not be any effect on in stream flow.

No significant impacts to local or regional water resources are anticipated.

6. AIR QUALITY:

What pollutants or particulate would be produced? Identify air quality regulations or zones (e.g. Class I air shed) the project would influence. Identify cumulative effects to air quality.

The installation and use of this project would not likely produce any air pollutants or fugitive dust.

No significant impacts to air quality are anticipated.

7. VEGETATION COVER, QUANTITY AND QUALITY:

What changes would the action cause to vegetative communities? Consider rare plants or cover types that would be affected. Identify cumulative effects to vegetation.

A small and non-continuous area of area may be disturbed by the entry and operation of drilling equipment. Tis area will not amount to much and must be mitigated by both the driller and the proponent.

The overall health of the range plants may increase due to better distribution of grazing animals. This will take grazing pressure off of the creek bottom which will allow for better plant vigor with decreased grazing pressure.

If re-seeding is necessary the proponent will acquire certified, weed free seed and refer to the Plant Materials Tech Note No. MT-46 (Rev. 4) dated September 2013 for seeding rates.

No rare plants or cover types are present. No significant impacts to vegetation are anticipated.

8. TERRESTRIAL, AVIAN AND AQUATIC LIFE AND HABITATS:

Consider substantial habitat values and use of the area by wildlife, birds or fish. Identify cumulative effects to fish and wildlife.

This project should not negatively impact the habitat of the site and may improve it by providing a good source of water to wildlife during dryer times of year.

No significant impacts to terrestrial, avian, or aquatic habitats are anticipated.

9. UNIQUE, ENDANGERED, FRAGILE OR LIMITED ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES:

Consider any federally listed threatened or endangered species or habitat identified in the project area. Determine effects to wetlands. Consider Sensitive Species or Species of special concern. Identify cumulative effects to these species and their habitat.

	Aquile chryzaelos)		SO Count. 42	Obs Count: 50	Earliest Obs 2000	Recent Obs: 2019
View in Field Guide Species of Concern Native Species Global Rank: GS State Rank: S3	Bornsy, Status USFWS, BGEPA; MBTA; BCC17 USFS DLM: SENSITIVE FWP SWAP; SGCN3 PIF:	Defined and gase suffered by a minimum is stance of 3,000 motions in order to be domentative about encourablishing the entire breading sentiony and area commonly used for nevesting and otherwise outliened by me materium is stance of 10,000 motions.	locational uncerta	inty associated with the	observation up to a	Last Updated Jan 63, 2020
Birds - Greater Sage-G	rouse (Centrocerous urophasianu		50 Count 7	Obe Count 19	Earliest Obs 1973	Recent Obs: 2010
View in Field Guide Species of Concern Native Species Global Rank: G3G4 State Rank: S2	Sensitive - Suspected on Forests (CG, MLC) BLM: SENSITIVE FWP SWAP: SGCN2 PIF: 1	Delineation Cifferd Confirmed Develop and based on the prevents of a mest, chick, juveries, or easils on a lick. Port observations are mapped in the order of a one-equant mishes again to protect the exect incursions of less. The outer receives an object to be prevented as the prevented as the prevented as the chick of the order of the control of th	edges of this hexa If the locational un	igen are then buffered i certainty associased wi		Last Updated Sep 25, 2019
	lew (Numerius americanus)		50 Count 1	Obs Count. 1	Earliest Obs: 2019	Recent Obs 2016
View in Field Guide Species of Concern Native Species Global Rank: G5 State Rank: S3B	Agency Status USFWS, MBIA; BCC10; BCC11; BCC17 USFS: BLM: SEN SITVE FWF SWAP: SGCN3	Oblination Critical Confirmed presence and a presence of a neat, chicks, or laminor is able to during the breading season. Point costernal on location is buildined by a minimum distance of 200 maters in order to approximate the increasing its subfered by the locational understangly associated with the observation up to a maximum distance of 10,000 meters.	preeding territory s	ize reported for the spi	ices in Idaho and	Last Updated Sep 24, 2019
July Kalik 330	PIF: 2					
# 50 ID: 50576086	PIF: 2		Acres 31	Obe Count 1	Earliest Obs: 2019	Recent Obs: 201
₩ 50 ID: 50576086	PIF: 2 by Dace (Chrosomuseos)		Acres 31 50 Count 1	Obs Count 1	Earliest Obs 2019	Recent Obs: 201

There are 4 species of concern present in the area around the project. 3 of them are birds, 2 of which (Golden eagle and Curlew), are not likely to be affected because the site is not good quality nesting habitat. The sage grouse are also not likely to be affected because of the lack of good cover. The site is within 3 miles of a previously recorded lek, however the lek is now unsuitable habitat because it is in the middle of a wheat field.

This activity is exempt under Montana Executive Order 12-2015 Montana Sage Grouse Habitat Conservation Program and requires no consultation from the Montana Sage Grouse Oversite Team. However, the proponent will be required to install escape ramps in the stock water tank to allow birds to get out of the tank if they fall in.

No significant impacts to unique, endangered, fragile or limited environmental resources are anticipated, though temporary displacement of local wildlife may occur during the project.

10. HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES:

Identify and determine effects to historical, archaeological or paleontological resources.

A Class I (literature review) level review was conducted by the DNRC staff archaeologist for the area of potential effect (APE). This entailed inspection of project maps, DNRC's sites/site leads database, land use records, General Land Office Survey Plats, and control cards. The Class I search revealed that *Antiquities* have not been identified in the APE. No additional archaeological investigative work will be conducted in response to this proposed development. However, if previously unknown cultural or paleontological materials are identified during project related activities, all work will cease until a professional assessment of such resources can be made.

No significant effects on historical, archaeological, or paleontological resources anticipated.

11. AESTHETICS:

Determine if the project is located on a prominent topographic feature, or may be visible from populated or scenic areas. What level of noise, light or visual change would be produced? Identify cumulative effects to aesthetics.

There will just be one stock water tank installed out of site of the county road. The tank is a common site in the area that is mostly a rural agricultural area. There will be no addition noise or light changes to the area.

No significant impacts on the aesthetics of the area are anticipated.

12. DEMANDS ON ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES OF LAND, WATER, AIR OR ENERGY:

Determine the amount of limited resources the project would require. Identify other activities nearby that the project would affect. Identify cumulative effects to environmental resources.

No limited environmental resources will be significantly impacted because of this project. This project will also not add any significant cumulative demands on environmental resources.

13. OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS PERTINENT TO THE AREA:

List other studies, plans or projects on this tract. Determine cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of current private, state or federal actions in the analysis area, and from future proposed state actions in the analysis area that are under MEPA review (scoped) or permitting review by any state agency.

There are no other projects or plans being considered on the tracts listed in this EA Checklist.

IV. IMPACTS ON THE HUMAN POPULATION

- RESOURCES potentially impacted are listed on the form, followed by common issues that would be considered.
- Explain POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATIONS following each resource heading.
- Enter "NONE" If no impacts are identified or the resource is not present.

14. HUMAN HEALTH AND SAFETY:

Identify any health and safety risks posed by the project.

There will be some risk associated with the installation of the project. It will be the responsibility of the proponent to mitigate this risk.

15. INDUSTRIAL, COMMERCIAL AND AGRICULTURE ACTIVITIES AND PRODUCTION:

Identify how the project would add to or alter these activities.

This project will not add to or deter from other industrial, agricultural, or commercial activities in the area.

16. QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYMENT:

Estimate the number of jobs the project would create, move or eliminate. Identify cumulative effects to the employment market.

The project will not create or eliminate any jobs, so no significant effects to the employment market are anticipated.

17. LOCAL AND STATE TAX BASE AND TAX REVENUES:

Estimate tax revenue the project would create or eliminate. Identify cumulative effects to taxes and revenue.

There are no direct or cumulative effects to taxes or revenue for the proposed project.

18. DEMAND FOR GOVERNMENT SERVICES:

Estimate increases in traffic and changes to traffic patterns. What changes would be needed to fire protection, police, schools, etc.? Identify cumulative effects of this and other projects on government services

There will not be any significant increases in traffic, school attendance, or need for fire and police protection if this project is approved.

19. LOCALLY ADOPTED ENVIRONMENTAL PLANS AND GOALS:

List State, County, City, USFS, BLM, Tribal, and other zoning or management plans, and identify how they would affect this project.

There are no zoning or other agency management plans affecting this project.

20. ACCESS TO AND QUALITY OF RECREATIONAL AND WILDERNESS ACTIVITIES:

Identify any wilderness or recreational areas nearby or access routes through this tract. Determine the effects of the project on recreational potential within the tract. Identify cumulative effects to recreational and wilderness activities.

There will be no significant direct or cumulative effects on access to or quality of recreation and wilderness activities because of this project.

21. DENSITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION AND HOUSING:

Estimate population changes and additional housing the project would require. Identify cumulative effects to population and housing

The proposed project does not include any changes to housing or developments.

22. SOCIAL STRUCTURES AND MORES:

Identify potential disruption of native or traditional lifestyles or communities.

There are no native, unique or traditional lifestyles or communities in the vicinity that would be significantly impacted by the proposal.

23. CULTURAL UNIQUENESS AND DIVERSITY:

How would the action affect any unique quality of the area?

The proposed project will have no significant impact on any culturally unique quality of the area.

24. OTHER APPROPRIATE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CIRCUMSTANCES:

Estimate the return to the trust. Include appropriate economic analysis. Identify potential future uses for the analysis area other than existing management. Identify cumulative economic and social effects likely to occur as a result of the proposed action.

The proposed project will not have any significant cumulative economic or social effect.

numeror one could be experienced v. FINDING
25. ALTERNATIVE SELECTED:
Alternative B (the Proposed Action) – Under this alternative, the Department does grant permission to install a well and stock water tank.
26. SIGNIFICANCE OF POTENTIAL IMPACTS:
I have evaluated the potential environment effects and have determined no significant impact to the environment because of this project.
27. NEED FOR FURTHER ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS:
EIS More Detailed EA X No Further Analysis
EA Checklist Prepared By: Name: Dustin Lenz Land Use Specialist
Signature: Date: 20 APRIL 2021
EA Checklist Name: Jocee Hedrick
Approved By: Title: Unit Manager, Northeastern Land Office
Signature: Occe Hedricle Date: 4/30/3021

